arXiv:1412.6517v1 [hep-th] 19 Dec 2014

A relation between deformed superspace and Lee-Wick higher-derivative theories

M. Dias

Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Departamento de Ciências Exatas e da Terra, Rua Prof. Artur Riedel, 275, 09972-270, Diadema, SP, Brazil

A. F. Ferrari

Universidade Federal do ABC, Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas, Rua Santa Adélia, 166, 09210-170, Santo André, SP, Brazil.

C. A. Palechor

Universidade Federal do ABC, Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas, Rua Santa Adélia, 166, 09210-170, Santo André, SP, Brazil.

C. R. Senise Jr.

Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Departamento de Ciências Exatas e da Terra, Rua Prof. Artur Riedel, 275, 09972-270, Diadema, SP, Brazil

Abstract

We propose a type of non-anticommutative superspace, with the interesting property of relating to Lee-Wick type of higher derivatives theories, which are known for their interesting properties, and have lead to proposals of phenomenologicaly viable higher derivatives extensions of the Standard Model. The deformation of superspace we consider does not preserve supersymmetry or associativity in general; however, we show that a non-anticommutative version of the Wess-Zumino model can be properly defined. In fact, the definition of chiral and antichiral superfields turns out to be simpler in our case than in the well known $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetric case. We show that, when the theory is truncated at the first nontrivial order in the deformation parameter, supersymmetry is restored, and we end up with a well known Lee-Wick type of higher derivative extension of the Wess-Zumino model. Thus we show how non-anticommutative could provide an alternative mechanism for generation of these kind of higher derivative theories.

1. Introduction

The fundamental nature of spacetime at the Planck scale is still considered to be an open question, and the emergence of some type of noncommutativity between coordinates has been studied in different contexts for some time [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. One of the nontrivial aspects of these studies is the fate of spacetime symmetries when noncommutativity is considered:

Email addresses: marco.dias@unifesp.br (M. Dias), alysson.ferrari@ufabc.edu.br (A. F. Ferrari), caanpaip@gmail.com (C. A. Palechor), carlos.senise@unifesp.br (C. R. Senise Jr.)

the Poincaré symmetry can be broken by the noncommutativity such as in the low energy description of some string dynamics with a fixed background [5], it can be preserved in some adequate sense [7, 8], or deformed in an algebraically consistent way, such as in the context of kappa deformed spacetimes [3, 2]. Poincaré symmetry is one of the conceptual cornerstones of the current understanding of elementary interactions, and besides that, in the last decades the possibility of small deviations of Lorentz symmetry has been studied in a systematic way [9], providing increasingly stronger phenomenological constraints on Lorentz violation [10]: these facts reinforce the interest in studying the fundamental symmetries of proposed deformations of spacetime, including those involving noncommuting coordinates.

Supersymmetry is known to be the essentially unique consistent extension of the Poincaré symmetry [11], and not surprisingly, the possibility of implementing noncommutative deformations of superspace has also been studied for some time. Following the discovery of the connection between noncommutative geometry and superstring theory, a string configuration where a supersymmetric field theory with spacetime noncommutativity appears as a low energy limit was identified in [12]. In this case, supersymmetry is left untouched by the deformation, which affects only the spacetime coordinates x^μ, while fermionic coordinates θ^α, $\bar{\theta}^\alpha$ satisfy usual anticommutation relations: because of this, all the superspace formalism for studying classical and quantum aspects of supersymmetric field theories can be preserved in the study of its noncommutative counterparts [13, 14, 15, 16].

In [17], a general discussion of non trivial (anti)commutations relations between spacetime (and spinorial) coordinates of superspace was presented, and not surprisingly the discussion becomes more complicated if the algebra of the fermionic coordinates θ^α, $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ is modified: it was pointed out that in the non-anticommutative case, in general the supersymmetry algebra is deformed, and the associativity of the products of superfields is lost. The authors of [17] discussed a special case where associativity is maintained, and a more general study of non-anticommutative deformations of superspace which preserve the essential properties of supersymmetry and associativity can be developed using the formalism of twist deformations of Hopf algebras [18, 19, 20].

In [21], another interesting connection between string theory and non-anticommutative theory was unveiled. In this case the anticommutation relation involving fermionic coordinates θ^α is the primary source of deformation, and the algebra of half of the supersymmetry generators is broken, hence the name $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry. The notion of chirality has to be dealt with properly, and a consistent interacting theory involving gauge and scalar superfields have been defined. The spurion technique can be used to treat these theories at the quantum level, and their renormalizability have been studied [22, 23, 24, 25]. We will review some aspects of the $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetric field theories in Sec. 2, since they will be relevant to our work.

In this work, we propose a new type of deformed superspace, one in which the anticommutator involving θ^α and $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ is deformed. We argue that this possibility has very interesting properties, mainly that at the second order in the deformation parameter, the scalar superfield theory defined in this non-anticommutative superspace exactly coincides with the higher derivative supersymmetric Wess-Zumino model studied, for example, in [26]. This is interesting because Lee-Wick type of theories [27, 28] have recently been revived in higher derivative

extensions of the Standard Model, which attempts to be phenomenologically viable and free of hierarchy problems [29, 30, 31, 32]. Supersymmetric models with higher derivative operators have also attracted some attention at the formal level in recent years [33, 34, 35]. The connection found in this work, between a particular form of deformation of superspace and the higher derivative supersymmetric model studied in [26, 33] is even more interesting because the former breaks supersymmetry in general, however we will show that at the second order of the deformation parameter, supersymmetry is fully restored in our model.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we review some aspects of the $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry construction, and propose our deformed superspace, discussing its main properties. The supersymmetric algebra in this deformed superspace is studied in Sec. 3, and it is shown to be also deformed, signaling that supersymmetry is not preserved by our construction in general. In Sec. 4, however, we show that we can define an action for scalar superfields in this deformed superspace, and how it becomes equivalent, at the second order of the deformation parameter, to a higher derivative, supersymmetric invariant Wess-Zumino model. Sec. 5 contains our conclusions and perspectives.

2. Deformed Superspace

We start by reviewing some of the basic aspects of the non-anticommutative superspace discussed in [21].

The four dimensional superspace has bosonic coordinates x^μ which are spacetime vectors, and fermionic coordinates θ^α, $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ which are two component Weyl spinors, whose indices can be lowered and raised with the antisymmetric symbols $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ and $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$, normalized according to $\epsilon^{12} = -\epsilon_{12} = 1$, and similarly for dotted indices. It is also useful to introduce the symbols

$$(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = (1, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3) \ , \tag{1a}$$

$$(\bar{\sigma}^\mu)^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha} = (1, -\sigma_1, -\sigma_2, -\sigma_3) \ , \tag{1b}$$

$$(\sigma^{\mu\nu})_\alpha^{\ \beta} = (\sigma^\mu\bar{\sigma}^\nu - \sigma^\nu\bar{\sigma}^\mu)_\alpha^{\ \beta} \ , \tag{1c}$$

σ_i being the Pauli matrices. Finally, supersymmetry generators and supercovariant derivatives are defined by

$$Q_\alpha = \partial_\alpha - i\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu \ , \ \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}} = -\bar{\partial}_{\dot{\alpha}} + i\theta^\alpha\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu \ , \tag{2a}$$

$$D_\alpha = \partial_\alpha + i\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu \ , \ \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} = -\bar{\partial}_{\dot{\alpha}} - i\theta^\alpha\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu \ . \tag{2b}$$

We refer the reader to [36] for other notations and definitions that are used in this work.

The deformation in superspace is introduced by assuming that the coordinates θ^α no longer anticommute, instead they satisfy

$$\left\{\theta^\alpha, \theta^\beta\right\} = c^{\alpha\beta} \, , \tag{3}$$

where $c^{\alpha\beta}$ is a two-dimensional symmetric matrix that plays the role of a deformation parameter. The $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ coordinates anticommute with themselves and θ^α as usual, but commutation

relations involving x^μ and θ^α are changed to

$$[x^\mu, x^\nu] = \overline{\theta\theta} c^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\beta\gamma} \left(\sigma^{\mu\nu}\right)_\alpha^{\ \gamma} \,, \tag{4}$$

$$[x^\mu, \theta^\alpha] = i c^{\alpha\beta} \sigma^\mu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} \,. \tag{5}$$

This particular algebra is interesting because if written in terms of chiral coordinates,

$$y^\mu = x^\mu + i\theta\sigma^\mu\bar{\theta} \,, \tag{6}$$

it implies that

$$[y^\mu, y^\nu] = [y^\mu, \theta^\alpha] = \left[y^\mu, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right] = 0 \,, \tag{7}$$

which simplifies the definition of chiral superfields.

Due to Eq. (3), products of the θ coordinate should be properly ordered, and when multiplying two functions of θ, the result should be reordered; this can be accomplished by means of a star product,

$$f(\theta) \star g(\theta) = f(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{c^{\alpha\beta}}{2} \frac{\overleftarrow{\partial}}{\partial\theta^\alpha} \frac{\overrightarrow{\partial}}{\partial\theta^\alpha}\right) g(\theta) \,, \tag{8}$$

which implements the Weyl (symmetric) ordering. It is noteworthy that the exponential in Eq. (8) is finite due to the anticommuting nature of the derivatives $\partial/\partial\theta^\alpha$. Chiral superfields are defined to be functions of y and θ alone, and when multiplying two chiral superfields via the star product, the result is still a chiral superfield.

Finally, when studying the anticommutation relations between the supersymmetry generators Q_α and $\bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}$, one finds the standard relations

$$\left\{Q_\alpha, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}\right\} = 2i\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\mu} \,, \tag{9}$$

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = 0 \,, \tag{10}$$

on the other hand,

$$\left\{\bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\beta}}\right\} = -4c^{\alpha\beta} \sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\beta}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^\mu \partial y^\nu} \,, \tag{11}$$

signaling that *half* of the supersymmetry generators is broken, thus the name $\mathcal{N} = 1/2$ supersymmetry for this construction.

One can continue to define antichiral and vector superfields, as done in [21], but at this point we shall present our proposal for a different non-anticommutative superspace. Our proposal is defined via a different star product that will be responsible for reordering

functions of θ and $\bar{\theta}$ that are multiplied together,

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) \star g(z) &= f(z) \exp\left[\frac{\xi}{2} C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \left(\overleftarrow{D}_{\alpha} \overrightarrow{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}} + \overleftarrow{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}} \overrightarrow{D}_{\alpha}\right)\right] g(z) \\ &= fg + \frac{\xi}{2}(-1)^{s_f}\left[\left(D_{\alpha} f\right)\left(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} g\right) + \left(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} f\right)\left(D_{\alpha} g\right)\right] \\ &- \frac{\xi^2}{16}|C|\left[\left(D^2 f\right)\left(\bar{D}^2 g\right) + \left(\bar{D}^2 f\right)\left(D^2 g\right)\right] \\ &- \frac{\xi^2}{8} C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\Big[(\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} D_{\alpha} f)(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} D_{\beta} g) \\ &\qquad + (D_{\beta} \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} f)(D_{\alpha} \bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}} g)\Big] + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$ is a symmetric tensor, $|C| = \frac{1}{2} C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} C^{\beta\dot{\beta}} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}$ is the determinant of $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$,

$$\xi = \frac{1}{M^2}\,, \tag{13}$$

M being a very large mass scale, whose significance will become clear afterwards, and s_f is the parity of the function $f(z)$, i.e. $s_f = 0$ if f is bosonic and $s_f = 1$ if f is fermionic.

Based on the definition in Eq. (12), we can calculate the deformed anticommutator between the fermionic variables θ and $\bar{\theta}$, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{\theta^{\alpha}, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right\}_{\star} &= \theta^{\alpha} \star \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} + \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} \star \theta^{\alpha} \\ &= \theta^{\alpha}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} + \frac{\xi}{2} C^{\beta\dot{\beta}} (-1)^1 (D_{\beta}\theta^{\alpha})(\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}) \\ &+ \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\theta^{\alpha} + \frac{\xi}{2} C^{\beta\dot{\beta}} (-1)^1 (\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}})(D_{\beta}\theta^{\alpha}) \\ &= \xi C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In the same fashion, we proceed to calculate the complete algebra of the variables x^{μ}, θ^{α}, $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ and also the chiral coordinates y^{μ} (see Eq. (6)) and antichiral ones,

$$\bar{y}^{\mu} = x^{\mu} - i\theta\sigma^{\mu}\bar{\theta}\,. \tag{15}$$

The result follows:

$$\left\{\theta^{\alpha}, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right\}_{\star} = \xi C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\,, \tag{16a}$$

$$\left\{\theta^{\alpha}, \theta^{\beta}\right\}_{\star} = \left\{\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}}\right\}_{\star} = 0\,, \tag{16b}$$

$$[x^{\mu}, x^{\nu}]_{\star} = \xi C^{\alpha\dot{\beta}} (\sigma^{\mu}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \sigma^{\nu}_{\beta\dot{\beta}} - \sigma^{\nu}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \sigma^{\mu}_{\beta\dot{\beta}}) \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}} \theta^{\beta}\,, \tag{17a}$$

$$[x^{\mu}, \theta^{\alpha}]_{\star} = -i\xi C^{\alpha\dot{\beta}} \sigma^{\mu}_{\beta\dot{\beta}} \theta^{\beta}\,, \tag{17b}$$

$$\left[x^{\mu}, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right]_{\star} = -i\xi C^{\beta\dot{\alpha}} \sigma^{\mu}_{\beta\dot{\beta}} \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}}\,, \tag{17c}$$

$$[x^\mu, y^\nu]_\star = -2\xi C^{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}}\theta^\alpha \ , \tag{18a}$$

$$[x^\mu, \bar{y}^\nu]_\star = 2\xi C^{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\theta^\beta \ , \tag{18b}$$

$$[y^\mu, y^\nu]_\star = [\bar{y}^\mu, \bar{y}^\nu]_\star = 0 \ , \tag{18c}$$

$$[y^\mu, \bar{y}^\nu]_\star = 4\xi C^{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\theta^\beta \ , \tag{18d}$$

and

$$[y^\mu, \theta^\alpha]_\star = 0 \ , \tag{19a}$$

$$\left[y^\mu, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right]_\star = -2i\xi C^{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\mu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\beta}} = 2\left[x^\mu, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right]_\star \ , \tag{19b}$$

$$[\bar{y}^\mu, \theta^\alpha]_\star = -2i\xi C^{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\theta^\beta = 2\left[x^\mu, \theta^\alpha\right]_\star \ , \tag{19c}$$

$$\left[\bar{y}^\mu, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right]_\star = 0 \ . \tag{19d}$$

Eqs. (16) define the essential non-anticommutative properties of this superspace. Most interesting are Eqs. (18c), (19a) and (19d), which show that the commutation relations involving chiral coordinates y^μ and θ^α, as well as those involving antichiral coordinates $\bar{y}^\mu$ and $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$, are not changed. This greatly simplifies the definition of chiral and antichiral superfields. For example, chiral superfields are of the form $\Phi\left(y^\mu, \theta^\alpha\right)$, and since y^μ and θ^α exhibit trivial (anti)commutation relations, chiral superfields do not have to be reordered and, clearly, the (usual) product of chiral superfields is again a chiral superfield. That means the holomorphic potential $W\left(\Phi\right)$ of the Wess-Zumino model is not affected by the non-anticommutativity. The same happens for antichiral superfields and, consequently, for the antiholomorphic potential. Any nontrivial modification brought by the superspace deformation to our model will be in the Kähler part of the action, $\int d^8z\, K\left(\Phi, \overline{\Phi}\right)$, which, in the standard Wess-Zumino action at the classical level, reduces to the kinetic term $\int d^8z\, \Phi\overline{\Phi}$.

This last observation is also very important for the following: the star product in Eq. (12) is non associative (one can see this as a corollary of the general discussion present in [17], or see discussion at the end of the next section). Therefore, defining star products of more than two superfields could introduce an ambiguity in the definition of a deformed action. However, since the star product does not appear in the potentials of the Wess-Zumino action, we can define a deformed Wess-Zumino model in our deformed superspace without dealing with this non associativity, at least at the classical level.

3. Operators Algebra

We present in this section the algebra of the supersymmetric generators and the covariant derivatives in our deformed superspace, which can be calculated directly from the definitions contained in the last section.

The only non vanishing anticommutators are,

$$\{Q_\alpha, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = 2i\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu + \xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu \ , \tag{20a}$$

$$\{D_\alpha, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = -2i\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu + \xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu \ , \tag{20b}$$

$$\{Q_\alpha, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = -\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu \ , \tag{20c}$$

$$\{\bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}, D_\alpha\}_\star = -\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\partial_\mu\partial_\nu \ . \tag{20d}$$

In a general way, defining $D_A = (D_\alpha, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}, \partial_\mu)$ and $Q_A = (Q_\alpha, \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}}, -\partial_\mu)$, the deformed algebra will have the following structure [17]

$$\begin{aligned}
[Q_A, Q_B\}_\star &= T_{AB}{}^C Q_C + R_{AB}{}^{CD} Q_C Q_D \ , \\
[D_A, D_B\}_\star &= T_{AB}{}^C D_C + R_{AB}{}^{CD} D_C D_D \ , \\
[Q_A, D_B\}_\star &= R_{AB}{}^{CD} Q_C D_D \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where $T_{AB}{}^C$ is the torsion and $R_{AB}{}^{CD} = -\frac{1}{8}P^{MN}T_{M[A}{}^C T_{B)N}{}^D$ is the curvature tensor. In our case, the only non vanishing tensors of these type are

$$T_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^\mu = -2i\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\beta}}\delta_\alpha^{\ \beta}\delta_{\dot{\alpha}}^{\ \dot{\beta}}\delta^\mu_\nu \ , \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\mu\nu} &= -\frac{1}{8}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}(T_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}{}^\mu T_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}{}^\nu + T_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}{}^\mu T_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}{}^\nu) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}(\sigma^\mu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}\sigma^\nu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}} + \sigma^\mu_{\beta\dot{\alpha}}\sigma^\nu_{\alpha\dot{\beta}}) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

therefore, the algebra in Eq. (20) can be written as

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = T_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^\mu Q_\mu + R_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\mu\nu} Q_\mu Q_\nu \ , \tag{24}$$

$$\{D_\alpha, D_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = T_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^\mu D_\mu + R_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\mu\nu} D_\mu D_\nu \ , \tag{25}$$

$$\{Q_\alpha, D_{\dot{\alpha}}\}_\star = R_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}{}^{\mu\nu} Q_\mu D_\nu \ . \tag{26}$$

From this result, we see that the supersymmetry algebra is broken in general in the deformed superspace. This could be seen as a setback in our construction, however, in the next section, we will see how this problem can be solved, at least if the parameter ξ is considered so small that the theory can be truncated at a certain order in ξ.

It is worthwhile to mention that, similar to the three-dimensional non-anticommutative superspace discussed in [37], one could define nonlinear generators $\widetilde{Q}_\alpha$, $\widetilde{\bar{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ and supercovariant derivatives $\widetilde{D}_\alpha$, $\widetilde{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ that respect the usual supersymmetry algebra, in the form

$$\widetilde{Q}_\alpha = Q_\alpha + \frac{i}{2}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\partial_\beta\partial_{\alpha\dot{\beta}} \ ; \ \widetilde{\bar{Q}}_{\dot{\alpha}} = \bar{Q}_{\dot{\alpha}} - \frac{i}{2}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\partial_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_{\beta\dot{\alpha}} \, , \tag{27a}$$

$$\widetilde{D}_\alpha = D_\alpha - \frac{i}{2}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\partial_\beta\partial_{\alpha\dot{\beta}} \ ; \ \widetilde{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}} = \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} + \frac{i}{2}\xi C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\partial_{\dot{\beta}}\partial_{\beta\dot{\alpha}} \, . \tag{27b}$$

These generators do not respect standard Leibniz rule and, being nonlinear, they could be naturally incorporated in the formalism of Hopf algebras. This observation raises the question of whether the deformation we defined in Eq. (12) could be understood as a supersymmetric Drinfeld twist as studied, for example, in [18, 19]. However, the answer to this

question is negative. Indeed, explicit calculation shows that the "twist element" that would correspond to Eq. (12) do not satisfy the two-cocycle condition that has to be satisfied to define a Drinfeld twist. This two-cocycle condition is what guarantees the associativity of the star product, so this last observation is another way to state the fact that the deformed product defined in Eq. (12) is not associative um general, as discussed at the end of Sec. 2.

4. Wess-Zumino model in the deformed superspace

To construct a Wess-Zumino action in the deformed superspace, we need first to calculate the products between superfields with different chiralities. Due to Eq. (14) they do not commute, and should be multiplied using the star product (12) to properly reorder the non-anticommuting coordinates. The star products between superfields Φ and $\bar{\Phi}$, truncated at the order ξ^2 is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi \star \bar{\Phi} = \Phi\bar{\Phi} + \frac{\xi}{2} C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} (D_\alpha \Phi)(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\Phi}) \\ - \frac{\xi^2}{16} |C| (D^2\Phi)(\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi}) + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3) \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\Phi} \star \Phi = \bar{\Phi}\Phi + \frac{\xi}{2} C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} (\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\Phi})(D_\alpha \Phi) \\ - \frac{\xi^2}{16} |C| (\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi})(D^2\Phi) + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3) \ .\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

These two expressions are different, so we have an ambiguity in the generalization of the Wess-Zumino kinetic term $\int d^8z\, \Phi\overline{\Phi}$ to the deformed superspace. We adopt a symmetric prescription,

$$\Phi \star \bar{\Phi} + \bar{\Phi} \star \Phi = 2\Phi\bar{\Phi} - \frac{\xi^2}{8} |C| (D^2\Phi)(\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi}) + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3) \ , \tag{30}$$

where in obtaining the right hand side we used the symmetry of $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$ and the fact that $D_\alpha\Phi\, \bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\Phi} = -\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\Phi}\, D_\alpha\Phi$.

We use Eq. (30) to define the free Wess-Zumino model in the deformed superspace as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{2}\int d^8z (\Phi \star \bar{\Phi} + \bar{\Phi} \star \Phi) \\ &= \int d^8z \left[\Phi\bar{\Phi} - \frac{\xi^2}{16}|C|(D^2\Phi)(\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi}) + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3)\right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Integrating by parts and using the relation $D^2\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi} = 16\Box\bar{\Phi}$, we obtain,

$$S = \int d^8z \left[\Phi(1 - \xi^2|C|\Box)\bar{\Phi} + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3)\right] \ . \tag{32}$$

In terms of component fields, this last equation is written as

$$\begin{aligned} S = \int d^4x \left[A(1 - \xi^2|C|\Box)\Box\bar{A} + i\partial_\mu\psi\sigma^\mu(1 - \xi^2|C|\Box)\bar{\psi} \right. \\ \left. + F(1 - \xi^2|C|\Box)\bar{F} + \mathcal{O}(\xi^3)\right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Eqs. (32) and (33), together with the fact pointed out in Sec. 2 that the (anti)holomorphic

potentials are not modified by the star product, mean that the net effect of the superspace deformation is the introduction of Lee-Wick type terms in the action. Most interestingly, the action in Eq. (32) is supersymmetric invariant. This is a result of the symmetric prescription adopted in Eq. (30), which cancels the linear terms present in Eqs. (28) and (29): these linear terms are the only non supersymmetric terms up to order ξ^2. Indeed, the $\mathcal{O}(\xi^1)$ term in Eq. (29), for example, is written in terms of component fields as follows,

$$S_{\bar{D}\bar{\Phi}D\Phi} = \int d^4x \, \frac{\xi}{2} \, C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \left[i \, \sigma^{\mu}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \left(\partial_\mu A \cdot \Box \bar{A} - \Box A \, \partial_\mu A + \bar{F} \partial_\mu F - F \partial_\mu \bar{F} \right) + \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{1}{2} \left(\psi_\alpha \Box \bar{\psi}_{\dot{\alpha}} + \Box \psi_\alpha \cdot \bar{\psi}_{\dot{\alpha}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \zeta^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta \, \dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \left(\partial_\mu \psi^\beta \partial_\nu \bar{\psi}^{\dot{\beta}} + \partial_\nu \psi^\beta \cdot \partial_\mu \bar{\psi}^{\dot{\beta}} \right) \right], \qquad (34)$$

where

$$\zeta^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta \, \dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} = \sigma^{\mu}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \sigma^{\nu}_{\beta\dot{\beta}} + \sigma^{\nu}_{\alpha\dot{\beta}} \sigma^{\mu}_{\beta\dot{\alpha}} \, . \qquad (35)$$

By integrating by parts, $S_{\bar{D}\bar{\Phi}D\Phi}$ can be cast as

$$S_{\bar{D}\bar{\Phi}D\Phi} = \int d^4x \, \frac{\xi}{2} \, C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \left[i \, \sigma^{\mu}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \left(2 \, \partial_\mu \Box A \cdot \bar{A} + 2 \, \bar{F} \partial_\mu F \right) + \right.$$
$$\left. + \left(\Box \psi_\alpha \cdot \bar{\psi}_{\dot{\alpha}} \right) - \zeta^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta \, \dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}} \, \partial_\nu \partial_\mu \psi^\beta \cdot \bar{\psi}^{\dot{\beta}} \right] . \qquad (36)$$

It is a straightforward, yet cumbersome calculation, to verify that Eq. (36) is not invariant under the standard supersymmetric transformations.

Therefore, despite the broken supersymmetric algebra discussed in Sec. 3, if the model is truncated at order ξ^2, we can use the ordering ambiguity introduced by the deformation itself to cancel the non symmetric parts, thus restoring supersymmetry. Actually, we verified that the $\mathcal{O}(\xi^3)$ terms in Eqs. (29) and (29) behave in the very same way as the $\mathcal{O}(\xi^1)$ terms, i.e., they cancel with the symmetric prescription adopted in Eq. (30), so actually Eq. (32) holds up to $\mathcal{O}(\xi^4)$ terms.

As a conclusion, we can state that, at the first nontrivial order in the deformation parameter ξ, the particular form of the non-anticommutativity considered by us presents itself as an alternative mechanism for the generation of a very important class of higher derivative theories, which usually are considered to appear as a result of the integration of fields with very large mass [26].

Finally, from Eq. (32) we see that the parameter ξ is indeed inversely proportional to the square of the mass scale where the higher dimensional operators are relevant (see discussion in [26] for example); this justifies our definition (13).

5. Conclusions and Perspectives

In this work, we proposed an alternative deformed superspace, which has the interesting property of being connected with higher derivative theories that are well studied in the literature, relevant even to phenomenological models based on the Standard Model [32]. We defined a natural non-anticommutative version of the Wess-Zumino model in this superspace, showing that, despite the supersymmetry algebra being broken in general, supersymmetry is restored by a proper ordering prescription, if the theory is truncated at the first non trivial order in the deformation parameter ξ. These results leave us with some open questions

that deserve further investigation. The first would be the extension of this work to gauge theories. Another interesting perspective is to investigate quantum corrections and study the consistency of the model at the quantum level.

Acknowledgements. This work was partially supported by the Brazilian agencies Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel Superior (CAPES), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) and Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), via the following grants: CNPq 482874/2013-9 and FAPESP 2013/22079-8 (AFF), CAPES PhD grant (CAP).

References

[1] H. S. Snyder, Quantized space-time, Phys. Rev. 71 (1947) 38–41.

[2] J. Lukierski, A. Nowicki, H. Ruegg, New quantum Poincare algebra and k deformed field theory, Phys. Lett. B293 (1992) 344–352.

[3] S. Majid, H. Ruegg, Bicrossproduct structure of kappa Poincare group and noncommutative geometry, Phys. Lett. B334 (1994) 348–354. arXiv:hep-th/9405107.

[4] S. Doplicher, K. Fredenhagen, J. E. Roberts, The Quantum structure of space-time at the Planck scale and quantum fields, Commun. Math. Phys. 172 (1995) 187–220. arXiv:hep-th/0303037.

[5] N. Seiberg, E. Witten, String theory and noncommutative geometry, JHEP 09 (1999) 032. arXiv:hep-th/9908142.

[6] M. Chaichian, M. M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Tureanu, Hydrogen atom spectrum and the Lamb shift in noncommutative QED, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 2716. arXiv:hep-th/0010175.

[7] M. Chaichian, P. Presnajder, A. Tureanu, New concept of relativistic invariance in NC space-time: Twisted Poincare symmetry and its implications, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94 (2005) 151602. arXiv:hep-th/0409096.

[8] A. P. Balachandran, A. Pinzul, B. A. Qureshi, Twisted Poincaré Invariant Quantum Field Theories, Phys. Rev. D77 (2008) 025021. arXiv:0708.1779, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.025021.

[9] D. Colladay, V. A. Kostelecky, Lorentz-violating extension of the standard model, Phys. Rev. D58 (1998) 116002. arXiv:hep-ph/9809521.

[10] V. A. Kostelecky, N. Russell, Data Tables for Lorentz and CPT Violation, Rev. Mod. Phys. 83 (2011) 11. arXiv:0801.0287, doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.83.11.

[11] R. Haag, J. T. Lopuszanski, M. Sohnius, All Possible Generators of Supersymmetries of the s Matrix, Nucl.Phys. B88 (1975) 257. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90279-5.

[12] C.-S. Chu, F. Zamora, Manifest supersymmetry in noncommutative geometry, JHEP 0002 (2000) 022. arXiv:hep-th/9912153, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2000/02/022.

[13] S. Ferrara, M. Lledo, Some aspects of deformations of supersymmetric field theories, JHEP 0005 (2000) 008. arXiv:hep-th/0002084, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2000/05/008.

[14] S. Terashima, A Note on superfields and noncommutative geometry, Phys.Lett. B482 (2000) 276–282. arXiv:hep-th/0002119, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(00)00486-X.

[15] D. Zanon, Noncommutative perturbation in superspace, Phys.Lett. B504 (2001) 101–108. arXiv:hep-th/0009196, doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(01)00271-4.

[16] A. F. Ferrari, H. O. Girotti, M. Gomes, A. Y. Petrov, A. A. Ribeiro, V. O. Rivelles, A. J. da Silva, Towards a consistent noncommutative supersymmetric Yang- Mills theory: Superfield covariant analysis, Phys. Rev. D70 (2004) 085012. arXiv:hep-th/0407040.

[17] D. Klemm, S. Penati, L. Tamassia, Non(anti)commutative superspace, Class. Quant. Grav. 20 (2003) 2905–2916. arXiv:hep-th/0104190.

[18] Y. Kobayashi, S. Sasaki, Lorentz invariant and supersymmetric interpretation of noncommutative quantum field theory, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A20 (2005) 7175–7188. arXiv:hep-th/0410164.

[19] M. Ihl, C. Saemann, Drinfeld-twisted supersymmetry and non-anticommutative superspace, JHEP 0601 (2006) 065. arXiv:hep-th/0506057, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/01/065.

[20] M. Irisawa, Y. Kobayashi, S. Sasaki, Drinfel'd twisted superconformal algebra and structure of unbroken symmetries, Prog.Theor.Phys. 118 (2007) 83–96. arXiv:hep-th/0606207, doi:10.1143/PTP.118.83.

[21] N. Seiberg, Noncommutative superspace, N = 1/2 supersymmetry, field theory and string theory, JHEP 06 (2003) 010. arXiv:hep-th/0305248.

[22] A. Romagnoni, Renormalizability of N = 1/2 Wess-Zumino model in superspace, JHEP 10 (2003) 016. arXiv:hep-th/0307209.

[23] M. T. Grisaru, S. Penati, A. Romagnoni, Two loop renormalization for nonanticommutative N = 1/2 supersymmetric WZ model, JHEP 0308 (2003) 003. arXiv:hep-th/0307099, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2003/08/003.

[24] M. T. Grisaru, S. Penati, A. Romagnoni, Nonanticommutative superspace and N = 1/2 WZ model, Class.Quant.Grav. 21 (2004) S1391–1398. arXiv:hep-th/0401174, doi:10.1088/0264-9381/21/10/012.

[25] M. T. Grisaru, S. Penati, A. Romagnoni, Non(anti)commutative sym theory: Renormalization in superspace, JHEP 0602 (2006) 043. arXiv:hep-th/0510175, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/02/043.

[26] I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas, D. Ghilencea, Supersymmetric Models with Higher Dimensional Operators, JHEP 0803 (2008) 045. arXiv:0708.0383, doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/03/045.

[27] T. Lee, G. Wick, Negative Metric and the Unitarity of the S Matrix, Nucl.Phys. B9 (1969) 209–243. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(69)90098-4.

[28] T. Lee, G. Wick, Finite Theory of Quantum Electrodynamics, Phys.Rev. D2 (1970) 1033–1048. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.2.1033.

[29] B. Grinstein, D. O'Connell, M. B. Wise, The Lee-Wick standard model, Phys.Rev. D77 (2008) 025012. arXiv:0704.1845, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.025012.

[30] C. D. Carone, R. F. Lebed, Minimal Lee-Wick Extension of the Standard Model, Phys.Lett. B668 (2008) 221–225. arXiv:0806.4555, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.08.050.

[31] T. Figy, R. Zwicky, The other Higgses, at resonance, in the Lee-Wick extension of the Standard Model, JHEP 1110 (2011) 145. arXiv:1108.3765, doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)145.

[32] C. D. Carone, R. Ramos, M. Sher, LHC Constraints on the Lee-Wick Higgs Sector, Phys.Lett. B732 (2014) 122–126. arXiv:1403.0011, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.03.025.

[33] M. Dias, A. Y. Petrov, J. Senise, C.R., A. da Silva, Effective potential for a SUSY Lee-Wick model: the Wess-Zumino casearXiv:1212.5220.

[34] F. Gama, J. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov, Effective superpotential in the generic higher-derivative three-dimensional scalar superfield theory, Phys.Rev. D88 (6) (2013) 065029. arXiv:1308.5834, doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.065029.

[35] F. Gama, M. Gomes, J. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov, A. da Silva, On the one-loop effective potential in the higher-derivative four-dimensional chiral superfield theory with a nonconventional kinetic term, Phys.Lett. B733 (2014) 247–252. arXiv:1401.5414, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.04.054.

[36] J. Wess, J. Bagger, Supersymmetry and supergravity, Princeton, USA: Univ. Pr., 1992, 259 p.

[37] A. F. Ferrari, M. Gomes, J. R. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov, A. J. da Silva, The three-dimensional non-anticommutative superspace, Phys. Rev. D74 (2006) 125016. arXiv:hep-th/0607087.